
Web 2.0 Tools : A Millennium Tools for Knowledge Sharing in B-Schools

Karishma Gulati,

Research Scholar, Delhi School of Management (DSM), Delhi Technological University, Delhi

Neeru Mundra,

Associate Professor, ROFEL Business School, Vapi

Karan Trehan,

Senior Solution Designer, Business Analytics and Optimization, IBM, Delhi

Abstract

The Web 2.0 applications hold weighty potential in education sector because these are open in nature, easy in use and supports effectual association and communication. They change the conventional outlook of human knowledge and unlock more chances in teaching and learning. Now-a-days, countless teachers are exploring the utilization of Web 2.0 tools into teaching and learning. On the other hand, it will not be dubious to say that studies of teacher's perceptions and opinions are critical because they are momentous to the realization of technology innovations. The present study aimed to investigate teachers' use and perceptions of Web 2.0 technologies in teaching and learning. It is anticipated that the result of this study will be endowed with practical information that enables the management faculty to better understand the importance of Web 2.0 tools with teachers and student's use and perceptions of Web 2.0 technologies in teaching and learning. The present paper investigates teachers and student's familiarity with web 2.0 concepts, tools and services and applications related to learning. Management education, is meeting a dual challenge in the rate of acceptance of technology by their faculty and the quick speed of advancement, producing a unique set of challenges.

Keywords: - Knowledge Management, Web 2.0 tools.

1. Introduction

Knowledge is one of the most important strategic assets for new generation organization. There is a considerable amount of tacit knowledge which the employees hold, acts as a competitive advantage to the organization. It is a very important study organization to understand the factors which let the employees to share or not to share the imbibed knowledge. This proactive approach leads to implementation of appropriate management practices to encourage attitude which increases productivity, profitability, innovation and organizational competitiveness. In this modern world technology has become a pivot point of success for every organization and especially for educational institutes to provide students and teachers more options and flexibility. Web 2.0 can utilize the educational potential for learning and teaching. This new technology provides an increased emphasis on innovation, interactivity, collaboration, creativity, autonomy and cooperation. To understand this better it is required to explore the potential of using these technology. Web 2.0 refers to an alleged second generation of web-based applications and in meticulous the utilization of the web as a podium for user-generated content and web-based society (O'Reilly, 2005). It focuses on the capability for people to team up

and share information online. Web 2.0 technologies have completely changed access to information and communication which is very important for the success of any organization. It endowed with user-created content platform applications let users to add on to their knowledge in diverse formats like text, data, video and audio.

2. Research Objectives

- 1) To identify the advantages of web 2.0 in B-schools
- 2) To analyze that whether web 2.0 tools help in knowledge sharing.
- 3) To analyze the extent to which web 2.0 tools are used in B- schools
 - a) To compare the degree to which web 2.0 tools are used by Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professors.
 - b) To analyze the extent to which web 2.0 tools are used by faculty.

3. Research methodology

3.1 Data Collection

Sample of 484 respondents (by using convenience sampling) from various B Schools of Delhi to know the role of web 2.0 tools in B-schools has taken for the study. The research design is exploratory design including surveys, fact-findings, enquiries of different kinds. Data for this study were obtained from both the primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include discussion with the faculty of B- schools and filling up of questionnaire designed for the study. Secondary sources include internet, websites of various B- schools, etc. By means of survey and interviews, this exploratory research aims at clarifying the role of Web 2.0 in knowledge sharing in various B- schools of Delhi.

3.2 Data Analysis and Findings

- 1) To identify the advantages of web 2.0 in B-schools

Although the exhaustive literature review gave various advantages of web 2.0, but after pilot study and Delphi method the advantages were reduced to analyze those advantages of Web 2.0 tools, descriptive statistics (using SPSS) is done.

Table 1

Pearson Correlations		Anytime access as advantage of Web 2.0 tools	Internet in mobile phones of respondents	Std. Deviation
Anytime access as advantage of Web 2.0 tools	Pearson Correlation	1	.832**	.165
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	
	N	484	484	
Internet in mobile phones respondents	Pearson Correlation	.832**	1	.269
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	484	484	
Interactive user interface			2.72	.168
Collective intelligence/ Knowledge sharing			3.02	.766
Storage facilities			2.40	.978

Interpretation: The result (Table 1) shows that collective intelligence or knowledge sharing is the most acceptable advantage by Bschools with the highest mean of 3.02. Following it, other advantages are interactive user interface, support collaboration, storage facilities. Although web 2.0 tools have the benefit of anytime access but still not much acceptable as it is only for those having internet facilities in their mobile. This is validated by examining the correlation between the two variables i.e. anytime access as advantage of Web 2.0

tools and whether the respondents have internet in their mobile phones.

H0: There is no correlation between respondents having internet in their mobile phones and anytime access of web 2.0 tools as their advantage.

Table 2

Pearson correlations between anytime access as advantage of Web 2.0 tools and whether the respondent have internet in their mobile phones

--

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Interpretation: As p value (Table 2) is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and high correlation of 0.832 can be easily interpreted from table 2.

- 2) To analyze that whether web 2.0 tools really help in knowledge sharing, Pearson correlation is used.

H0: There is no relation between the use of web 2.0 tools and knowledge sharing

H1: There is relation between the use of web 2.0 tools and knowledge sharing

Table 3

Pearson correlations between Knowledge sharing and use of web 2.0 tools

Person Correlation		Use of web 2.0 tools	Knowledge sharing
Use of web 2.0 tools	Pearson Correlation	1	.981**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	484	484
Knowledge sharing	Pearson Correlation	.981**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	484	484

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Interpretation: As p value (Table 3) is less than 0.05, this rejects the null hypothesis and accepts alternative hypothesis, showing that there is relation between use of web 2.0 tools and knowledge sharing. Also, the Pearson correlation value of 0.981 shows that there is

high correlation between the two and more will be the usage of Web 2.0 tools more will be the knowledge sharing.

- 1) To analyze the extent to which web 2.0 tools are used in B- schools

To compare the degree to which web 2.0 tools are used by assistant professor, associate professor and professors.

H0: $\mu_0 = \mu_1 = \mu_2$ (Web 2.0 tools are equally used by Assistant professors, Associate professors and Professors for knowledge sharing)

Where μ_0 – Use of web 2.0 tools by Assistant professors

μ_1 – Use of web 2.0 tools by Associate professors

μ_2 – Use of web 2.0 tools by Professors

By applying One way ANOVA, following is the table:

Table 4
ANOVA

ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8.944E10	2	4.472E10	434.481	.000
Within Groups	4.848E10	481	1.029E8		
Total	1.379E11	483			

Interpretation: As p value (Table 4) is < 0.05 , this rejects the null hypothesis. This means Web 2.0 tools are not equally used by Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors for knowledge sharing. This can be possible also if one of the cases is not equal. To check this, LSD (Least Significance Difference) is used in Post Hoc test.

Post Hoc test by using LSD

Table 5:
Multiple Comparisons using LSD

(I) Category	(J) Category	Sig.
Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	.126
	Professor	.000
Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	.126
	Professor	.000
Professor	Assistant Professor	.000
	Associate Professor	.000

Interpretation: As significance value (i.e. “p” value) in Table 5 for the group Assistant and Associate professor is greater than 0.05, this accepts null hypothesis; but for other groups p value is less than 0.05, this rejects null hypothesis. This reveals that associate and assistant professor use web 2.0 tools equally but not the professors.

- b) To which extent web 2.0 tools are used by faculty
Now the question arises that which category uses more

web 2.0 tools. To answer this, cross tabulation is used.

Table 6
Cross tabulation for category of employee and their usage of Web 2.0 tools

Use web 2.0 tools	Category	Assistant Professors	Associate professors	Professors	Total
Yes		189	145	26	360
No		15	12	97	124
Total		204	157	123	484

Interpretation: Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are using more of web tools as they are more techsavvy as compared to Professors. In particular, older internet users are significantly less than younger ones. Older faculty (45 years old and older) were generally less comfortable than younger faculty members (ages 21 to 40 years old) with technological learning tools, such as online discussions, course navigation, and presentation software. They were also less comfortable with computer networks and were more accustomed to being isolated computer users. Younger generations have the highest level of comfort with technological tools, mainly with advanced tools like teaching tools, design software and spreadsheets. These results imply that Professors may need more time and clearer instructions when asked to perform an online task which is still outside of their comfort zone; they may also require guidance while navigating a course Web site or participating in a networked environment.

4. Conclusion

The growing influence of web 2.0 tools in twenty-first century has brought a paradigm shift for educational Institutes in India. Web 2.0 plays an important role in the strengths of educators by opening the doors to collaboration and participation. It persuades and assists the natural desire to share what you know and to learn from your colleagues. And fully embracing Web 2.0 is a logical extension of the attempts that so many educators have made to use the Internet to connect, collaborate, and create new knowledge. With this it is not dubious to say that web 2.0 tools helps in knowledge sharing or collective intelligence and it is proved in this study too. Although with the advent of IT web 2.0 tools can be used anywhere, anytime with internet activated mobile phones; but still there are some people who do not use laptops (that are portable for 24*7 access of internet) and do not have internet activated mobile phones. For these educators anytime access is not the benefit of web 2.0 tools but still there are educators who get beep on their mobile whenever there is any mail for them and they enjoy connecting to people every time and can share their ideas too. It is analyzed in the study that Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are more techsavvy than Professors. So for many educators, it’s an incredibly exciting and knowledgeable time.

References

1. Abrams, L.C., Cross, R., Lesser, E. and Levin, D.Z. (2003), "Nurturing interpersonal trust in knowledge-sharing networks", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 64-77.
2. Anderson, P. (2007), "What is Web 2.0? Ideas, technologies and implications for education", *JISC Technology & Standards Watch*, available at: www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/techwatch/tsw0701b.pdf (accessed 10 March 2009).
3. Alexander, B. (2006), "Web 2.0: a new wave of innovation for teaching and learning", *EDUCAUSE Review*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 32-44.
4. Christina Matschke, Johannes Moskaliuk, Ulrike Cress, *Journal of Knowledge Management Emerald Article: Knowledge exchange using Web 2.0 technologies in NGOs*, VOL. 16 NO. 1 2012, pp. 159-176, Q Emerald Group Publishing Limited, ISSN 1367-3270.
5. Cress, U., Kimmerle, J. and Hesse, F.W. (2006), "The information-exchange with shared databases as a social dilemma – the effects of metaknowledge, bonus systems, and costs", *Communication Research*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 370-90.
6. Edwards, M. (1997), "Organizational learning in non-governmental organizations: what have we learned?", *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 235-50.
7. Emory M. Craig, *Campus-Wide Information Systems Emerald Article: Changing paradigms: managed learning environments and Web 2.0*, Vol. 24 No. 3, 2007 pp. 152-161 q Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
8. Elliot, B. (2007), "E-assessment: what is Web 2.0?", available at: www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/22941.html.
9. Farmer, J. (2006), "When digital dodos meet digital natives: the emerging redemption of online education", forthcoming conference on Internet Research 7.0: Internet Convergences, Brisbane, Australia, available at: <http://conferences.aoir.org/viewabstract.php>.
10. Fahri Karakas, *Welcome to World 2.0: the new digital ecosystem*, *Journal of Business Strategy Emerald Article*, VOL. 30 NO. 4 2009, pp. 23-30, Q Emerald Group Publishing Limited, ISSN 0275-6668
11. Liana Razmerita, Kathrin Kirchner, Frantisek Sudzina, *Personal knowledge management: The role of Web 2.0 tools for managing knowledge at individual and organisational levels*, Vol. 33 No. 6, 2009, pp. 1021-1039 q Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
12. Ricardo Colomo-Palacios, *Web 2.0: new and challenging practical issues*, Emerald Article.
13. Sotirios Paroutis, Alya Al Saleh, *Journal of Knowledge Management Emerald Article: Determinants of knowledge sharing using Web 2.0 technologies*, VOL. 13 NO. 4 2009, pp. 52-63, Q Emerald Group Publishing Limited, ISSN 1367-3270.
14. Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. (1986), "The social identity theory of intergroup behavior", in Worchel, S. and Austin, W.G. (Eds), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, 2nd Ed., Nelson-Hall Publishers, Chicago, IL, pp. 7-24.
15. Wodzicki, K., Moskaliuk, J. and Cress, U. (2011), "Patterns for social practices: a psychological perspective", in Kohls, C. and Wedekind, J. (Eds), *Investigations of E-learning Patterns: Context Factors, Problems and Solutions*, IGI Global, Hershey, PA, pp. 257-71.